

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

BECKLEY DIVISION

OSCAR DUNKINS,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:09-cv-00940

WARDEN D. BERKEBILE,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
ADOPTING PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed Petitioner's *Petition For The Issuance Of A Writ Of Habeas Corpus, Pursuant To 28 U.S.C. § 2241(3)* (Document 1). By Order (Document 2) entered on August 17, 2009, this action was referred to the Honorable R. Clarke VanDervort, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this Court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). On June 1, 2012, the Magistrate Judge submitted Proposed Findings and Recommendation ("PF&R") (Document 13), wherein it is recommended that this Court dismiss Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and remove this matter from the Court's docket.

The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th

Cir.1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir.1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir.1982). Objections to the PF&R in this case were due no later than June 18, 2012. To date, no party has filed any objections.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** and incorporates herein the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the Proposed Findings and Recommendation, and **ORDERS** that Petitioner’s *Petition For The Issuance Of A Writ Of Habeas Corpus, Pursuant To 28 U.S.C. § 2241(3)* (Document 1) be **DISMISSED**. Further, the Court **ORDERS** that this matter be removed from the docket.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: June 21, 2012

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Irene C. Berger", is written over a horizontal line.

IRENE C. BERGER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA